



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.         | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/666,209              | 09/17/2003  | Peter B. Evans       | 23990-08225         | 8289             |
| 758                     | 7590        | 12/27/2007           |                     |                  |
| FENWICK & WEST LLP      |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SILICON VALLEY CENTER   |             |                      | LO, SUZANNE         |                  |
| 801 CALIFORNIA STREET   |             |                      |                     | ART UNIT         |
| MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041 |             |                      |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                         |             |                      | 2128                |                  |
|                         |             |                      |                     | MAIL DATE        |
|                         |             |                      | 12/27/2007          | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                         |             |                      |                     | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                        |                     |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                          | 10/666,209             | EVANS ET AL.        |
|                          | Examiner<br>Suzanne Lo | Art Unit<br>2128    |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Suzanne Lo. (3) Brian G. Brannon.  
 (2) Kamini Shah, SPE. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Optimal Technologies.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained the prior art method of load flow analysis of modeling electric power networks. Examiner requested Applicants to submit disclosures of load flow analysis methods as well as any available reports on the use of Aempfast software by Optimal Technologies. The Examiner also recommended the Applicant amend claims 2 and 10 to include the limitation of assessing the electric power network by characterizing power flow, losses, voltage profile and power factor instead of assessing by load flow analysis to avoid 112 issues.



KAMINI SHAH  
EXAMINER